

# Exhibit 4

**BOSY & BENNETT**

Attorneys and Counselors  
300 N. LaSalle St., 49<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60654  
(312) 803-0437  
www.bosybennett.com

George S. Bosy  
gbosy@bosybennett.com  
(T) (312) 803-0432

**VIA E-MAIL**

Indranil Mukerji  
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005

December 30, 2010

Re: *Parallel Networks, LLC v. Abercrombie & Fitch., et al*;  
Civ. Act. No. 6:10-cv-111 (E.D.Tex – Tyler Division)

Dear Mr. Mukerji:

This is in response to Amazon.com, Inc.'s ("Amazon") notice of Rule 30(b)(6) deposition of Parallel Networks, LLC, dated December 21, 2010. For the reasons discussed below, Parallel Networks declines to provide a witness in response to Amazon's Rule 30(b)(6) notice at this time.

The four topics listed in Schedule A of the notice clearly ask for a witness to testify with respect to Parallel Networks's infringement contentions. As you know, Parallel Networks has previously provided Amazon with its infringement contentions in a timely fashion pursuant to the discovery schedule in this action. Nothing further is required from Parallel Networks at this time. In addition, Amazon itself has asserted that contention discovery is not appropriate at this time:

Amazon objects to this interrogatory as premature until the Court issues a claim construction in this lawsuit. A requirement that a party provide contentions of this sort early in the litigation is in tension with the established time frames for declaring claim construction positions provided by the Patent Rules.

(Amazon.com, Inc.'s Responses and Objections to Parallel Networks, LLC's First Set of Interrogatories (Nos. 1-13) at 8-9) (*see, e.g., Jacobs Chuck Mfg. Co. v. Shandong Weida Mach.*, No. 2:05-cv-00185 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 18, 2006); *Software Rights Archive, LLC v. Google Inc.*, No. 2:07-cv-00511 (E.D. Tex. May 26, 2010)). Significantly, Amazon's assertion that contention discovery is premature at this time was in response to an interrogatory asking Amazon to explain the basis for its belief that it does not infringe any of the claims of the patent in suit; also discovery is ongoing as Amazon freely concedes. Thus, by Amazon's own admission, Amazon's notice of deposition seeking Parallel Networks's infringement contentions is premature and therefore improper at this time. Finally, Parallel Networks expects to provide a very limited number of Rule 30(b)(6) witnesses in this action; as a consequence, efficiency dictates that most or all topics be covered in a limited number of depositions.

Indranil Mukerji  
December 30, 2010  
Page 2

Please call if you would like to discuss these issues.

Very truly yours,

/s/ George S. Bosy  
George S. Bosy  
**BOSY & BENNETT**  
*Attorney for Plaintiff*  
*Parallel Networks, LLC*

cc: Stephen A. Marshall, Fish & Richardson P.C.  
David R. Bennett, Bosy & Bennett  
Craig Tadlock, The Tadlock Law Firm